IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA AT RICHMOND

MARIO N. BAKER
PETITIONER,

Case No(s).:3:08-CR-0008

3:08CR088

3:10-CV-00579

VS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

RESPONDENT.

MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE – RULE 56(e)(2); IN RELATION TO THE MOVANT'S FILED PETITION PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 2255

Now comes, Mario N. Baker (hereinafter "Petitioner") proceeding *Sui Juris* in this instant action. The gist of this action is in-fact a request for this Honorable Court to enter into a summary judgment in favor of Petitioner pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. – Rule 56(e) (2), in relation to Petitioner's pending petition -- in this court -- pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

Petitioner request that this Court take judicial notice pursuant to Fed.R.Evid. - Rule 201(b) (2),(d),(f) in relation to Petitioner's attached affidavit to his memorandum of law, in support of his filed habeas corpus petition (28 U.S.C. § 2255). Furthermore, the Respondent (hereinafter "government") has responded to Petitioner's initial pleading, and Petitioner likewise has responded to the government's pleading in this case. However, the government has indeed failed to rebut Petitioner's affidavit point by point on its contained content.

Therefore, the content must be viewed as true, and this Court should rule in Petitioner's favor immediately, as a matter of law, as to the meritorious assertions, asserted in Petitioner's Petition (28 U.S.C. § 2255) and supporting memorandum of law with accompanying (unrebutted) affidavit. (See: Exhibit A) The government has yet to proffer any rebutting evidence to the contrary as to that asserted by Petitioner.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reason(s), this Honorable Court should grant summary pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. - Rule 56(e)(2).

I, Mac, o Baker, Mario N. Baker, declare under the penalty of perjury, under the law(s) of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that all of the foregoing is true, accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mario N. Baker

Reg. No.: 34194-183

F.C.I., McDowell

P.O. Box 1009

Welch, WV. 24801

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Mario N. Baker, certify that I caused to be mailed via, United States Postal Service, copies of the foregoing to the following parties:

(3) copies

Clerk of Court
United States District Court For The Eastern District of Virginia, Richmond Division
701 East Broad Street
Suite 3000
Richmond, Virginia 23219

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mario Nathaniel Baker, Petitioner,

٧s.

Case No. 3:08-c/-0008

United States of America Respondent.

Affidavit of Mario Nathaniel Baker

Now Comes The Affiant, Mario Nathaniel Baker, who depose and say:

- 1. I am the Petitioner in the above reference case.
- My attorney saw me on several occasions before trial, and he never discussed the ideal of filing a notion to suppress.
- 3. During one pretrial meeting, my attorney told me that my fingerprints weren't on the weapon in count (1), but the ballistic results weren't back on count(s): (2),(4), and (6). This pre-trial meeting took place well before my trial.
- 4. My attorney waited until the day of trial to tell me my fingerprints weren't on the weapon in count (4).
- 5. I wrote my attorney and told him to supplement the new intervening law Arizona V. Gant on my direct appeal before the Court of Appeals made their first decision.

I declare (or certify, verify, or state), under penalty or perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

